

MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP: PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING: Wednesday, July 11, 2001, 6:00 p.m., City Council Chambers, First Floor, County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jon Carlson, Patte Newman, Greg Schwinn, Cecil Steward and Steve Duvall (Linda Hunter and Tommy Taylor absent; Gerry Krieser and Russ Bayer declaring a conflict of interest); Kathleen Sellman, Stephen Henrichsen, Missy Minner and Jean Walker of the Planning Department; Roger Figard of Public Works & Utilities, other Department representatives, the consulting team, media and interested citizens.

STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING: Special Planning Commission Meeting
Public Hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments for the South and East Beltway Corridors

Vice-Chair Greg Schwinn called the meeting to order and discussed the protocol to be followed. The public hearing was opened for a staff presentation and public testimony on all four proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 94-62
SOUTH BELTWAY
½ MILE SOUTH OF SALTILLO ROAD FROM
HIGHWAY 77 TO HIGHWAY 2, INCLUDING PORTIONS
BETWEEN NORTH OF SALTILLO, EAST OF 98TH STREET;
and
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 94-63
EAST FAR BELTWAY
BETWEEN 134TH AND 148TH STREETS
FROM HIGHWAY 2 TO INTERSTATE 80;
and
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 94-64
EAST MIDDLE BELTWAY
BETWEEN 120TH AND 134TH STREETS,
FROM HIGHWAY 2 TO INTERSTATE 80;

and

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 94-65
EAST CLOSE BELTWAY
BETWEEN 98TH AND 112TH STREETS,
FROM HIGHWAY 2 TO INTERSTATE 80.
PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION

July 11, 2001

Members present: Schwinn, Steward, Duvall, Carlson and Newman; Hunter and Taylor absent; Bayer and Krieser declaring a conflict of interest.

Planning staff recommendation:

Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 94-62	Approval
Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 94-63	Denial
Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 94-64	Approval
Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 94-65	Denial

Staff Presentation:

Roger Figard appeared on behalf of the Public Works & Utilities Department and **Steve Henrichsen** appeared on behalf of the Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department. Figard reiterated that the staff recommendation on each proposal is a joint recommendation of both the Planning Department and the Public Works & Utilities Department. The information being presented will clearly illustrate that this has been a process undertaken by Lincoln over much time and it is a process that has brought forward all the information and proves to be a process which successfully helps Lincoln plan and bring forward projects.

Steve Henrichsen presented the rationale behind each of the four proposed amendments. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposals before the Commission would eliminate the south and east study corridors from the Comprehensive Plan and instead include a more specific route for the south and east beltway.

Henrichsen pointed out that the 1994 Comprehensive Plan included a statement requiring that the south and east beltway studies be done; the city has proceeded with the Beltway/Antelope Creek projects and analyzed the project as one way of completing the circumferential system for external to external truck traffic. The goals of the Comprehensive Plan also encourage inclusion of linear open space as well as major highways, integrated into development and open space patterns in developing parts of Lincoln. The Comprehensive Plan goals also suggest including trails and linear parks in

the development of new major transportation projects, such as Antelope Valley and the South and East Beltway. Another consideration of the studies was that the South and East Beltway were identified as extremely important links that will provide for ease of external trips around the perimeter of the City.

With regard to the impact of the roadway, the Comprehensive Plan encourages that traffic patterns and zoning that are compatible with existing land uses be maintained and that the character of the rural and urban neighborhood be retained. In addition, the Comprehensive goals include preservation of highly productive agricultural land for agrarian purposes, as well as allowing rural, nonagricultural residences; protection of ecological and historic sites in rural Lancaster County; maintenance, preservation and enhancement of native prairie and plants; preservation, conservation and expansion of the significant ecological resources and important historical sites that relate to the history and development of the community; and provisions for the mobility needs of the community through a balanced and efficient system of roads, trails and public transportation alternatives—not just roads.

Henrichsen then reviewed the history of the South and East Beltway, which began in November of 1994, when the south and east beltways were included in the Comprehensive Plan. Consultants were hired. In March of 1996, the first Comprehensive Plan Amendment extended the south study area to south of Bennet Road. Throughout 1996-97, the consultants evaluated hundreds of different alternatives and options. In June of 1997, the first recommendation came forward with the consultants recommending elimination of the East Far corridor. In June of 1997, the Planning Commission, City Council, County Board and Mayor met and there was a recommendation to eliminate the East Close route. Later in August of 1997, there was a meeting held to take citizen comments. On December 15, 1998, the City Council and County Board, in a joint meeting, recommended that in terms of the DEIS, only the East Far route should be considered. Many felt this was a decision. However, early in 1999, it became apparent that the Federal Highway Administration required all three east routes be reviewed and included in the DEIS. Henrichsen clarified that there was never an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to have only the East Far route. After that, additional study was done to conclude work on the DEIS. In March of 2001, the DEIS was released and the public comment period began in April. The end of the public comment period was June 15, 2001.

The Planning Commission is scheduled to take action on these proposals on July 25th. The public hearing process will continue before the City Council and County Board in a joint public hearing on August 15, 2001. All written information will be forwarded to the City Council and County Board.

South Beltway recommendation.

Henrichsen then proceeded to discuss the staff rationale for recommending approval of the South Beltway (**Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 94-62**) in relation to the Comprehensive Plan goals. The proposed South Beltway would complete the circumferential transportation network; provide internal traffic relief; will not reduce existing traffic on Hwy 2 but would reduce the amount of future increase; would serve the future urban area; would provide an alternative for trucks other than Hwy 2; it would provide a link for trails; it is along the future transmission line corridor of LES; and there are other opportunities for multi-use.

Henrichsen then discussed the difference between a "beltway" and a "bypass". A beltway is a circumferential road network. A bypass might be a route that goes outside an urban area but is not part of an overall beltway system.

The non-beltway options considered for the South Beltway included looking at the base road network including 98th and Yankee Hill Road and 84th & Pine Lake Road. One of the other non-beltway options that has been discussed is 148th Street; however, Prairie Home is along 148th Street. This would require 148th Street to have frontage roads and would have higher impacts and costs than the East Far and East Middle. 148th was also looked at in terms of non-beltway options, but it had high social costs and less travel time savings.

Henrichsen acknowledged that the proposed South Beltway does come with some social, economic and environmental implications--relocation of at least 5 homes and one business; adverse noise impacts on 5 homes; visual impacts on 27 homes; and impacts to wetlands and farm land. Overall, given the length of the route, the number of impacts have been minimized greatly. The cost estimate was 107 million in 1996. Some federal funds have been set aside for this roadway.

The staff recommendation is not based on any one factor but on numerous factors--including completion of the transportation functions as identified in the Comprehensive Plan, and in terms of Comprehensive Plan implementation, it does minimize some of the social and economic impacts.

East Far recommendation:

The East Far route (**Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 94-63**) is east of 134th between 134th and 148th. It would complete the road network; it would not provide any internal traffic relief to any large degree; it only reduces traffic along 84th four to eight percent; it would provide a truck route but has limited abilities in terms of providing a multi-

use corridor; there is much less possibility for trail routes along the beltway and less utility for a multi-use corridor, particularly compared to the East Middle. It would relocate 8 homes; have adverse noise impacts on an additional 7 homes; visual impacts on 41 homes; impacts on wetlands, prairies, and two NRD farm ponds. The East Far has more impacts in terms of historic structures than the other two routes, i.e. Stevens Creek Stock Farm and a total of 7 historic properties.

The estimated cost of the East Far is 128 million. None of the east routes have federal funds set aside. The East Far would require the greatest amount of road improvements leading to the route being the furthest from the city.

The Commission may hear concerns about urban sprawl. Henrichsen noted that the general goals of the Comprehensive Plan encourage contiguous development and efficient use of infrastructure. We already have the north and west beltways with I-80 and Hwy 77, and we have not seen any of the sprawl. The roads do not dictate our future--it is the community through its adopted plan that determines our future growth patterns.

The staff recommends denial of the East Far route because there is less opportunity as a multi-use corridor; less travel savings; some amount of backtracking; it has the greatest impacts to historic properties; and has more impacts than the East Middle and East Close in general.

East Middle recommendation:

The East Middle route (**Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 94-64**) completes the circumferential road network; there is only minor internal traffic relief; it would provide a truck route; it has the greatest potential for a multi-use corridor; there is open space potential; and LES already has a transmission line with 150' easement along a great majority of the corridor.

The impacts are relocation of 4 homes, but no businesses; adverse noise and visual impacts; it has the least amount of total area being the shortest of the three routes; there is potential for modification to one NRD farm pond; it impacts one historic property ½ mile away. Henrichsen stated that the staff takes very seriously the residential impacts; however, even with the East Middle there will be relocations, etc.

In general, the East Middle has fewer impacts in all categories than the East Close and fewer impacts on historic properties than the East Far.

The rationale for the recommendation of approval includes the greatest potential for a multi-use corridor; less backtracking; the least impact on residences; the least environmental impacts; and the least historic impacts.

East Close recommendation:

The East Close provides a minor amount of internal traffic relief; it would provide a truck route; it is remote from the LES power line and Stevens Creek; has much less in terms of potential for a multi-use corridor; requires relocation of six homes; adverse noise impact on 10 homes; and visual impact on 58 homes.

The staff recommends denial of the East Close route because in most categories the East Close has the most social and economic impacts.

Henrichsen then submitted additional information for the record, including a letter from James E. Arter, 6201 Rebel Drive, opposed to East Middle ([Exhibit 1](#)); a letter from Shannon Gartner, 6127 S. 27th Street, in support of the staff recommendation on the East Beltway project ([Exhibit 2](#)); a letter from Douglas J. Wilson, 6110 Old Farm Court, with various comments in regard to the routes ([Exhibit 3](#)); a letter from the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce in support of the South Beltway ([Exhibit 4](#)); and another letter from the Chamber of Commerce in support of the East Middle Beltway recommendation ([Exhibit 5](#)).

Public Testimony: (Note: If testimony was submitted in writing and read into the record, that testimony is attached as an exhibit and not repeated herein).

1. Svata Louda, 13700 Adams Street, testified in strong support of the staff recommendations. The East Middle route, compared to the East Close and East Far routes, conforms to the Comprehensive Plan most effectively. ([Exhibit 6](#)).

2. Scott W. Lewis, 4949 So. 148th Street, Walton, lives on the Herter/Hagaman/Sartore Farm, called the Waveland Farm, that is listed on the National Register of Historic Sites. Lewis testified on his own behalf as well as on behalf of Joel and Kathy Sartore, who own the historic property. Lewis submitted written testimony from Joel Sartore ([Exhibit 7](#)) in opposition to the East Far route. Lewis also submitted his testimony in writing in opposition to the East Far route and in support of the staff recommendation ([Exhibit 8](#)).

Lewis also submitted the July 2001 issue of National Geographic which contains an article on the nationwide problem of urban sprawl.

3. Wayne Hagaman, Box 306, Bennet, testified in support of the staff recommendation, particularly in opposition to the East Far route. **(Exhibit 9)**.

4. Charles D. Humble of Erickson & Sederstrom, 301 South 13th Street, appeared in opposition to a portion of the South Beltway. He represents **Art and Norma Hornung** who live at 1201 South 54th Street, and **Todd and Lisa Hornung**, who own land directly across the road. The Hornungs' ownership of this property goes back to Art's father in 1907, so they have had a tremendous interest in this property. The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment is to review a beltway route for conformance to the Comprehensive Plan, and, as noted, the beltway routes can serve as significant assets for existing and future patterns but it will have significant impact on some existing residents, including the Hornungs. In April of 1999, the Hornungs were pleased to see that the proposed route would pass further south of their farmstead and not take their property. The Hornung property is one of the five residences proposed to be taken, and it appears that the Hornung property is the only non-intersection relocation. Despite certain inconveniences, the Hornungs are willing to support the previous alignment. The now proposed alignment causes the Hornungs enormous social and economic impacts. They are elderly. This is their family home. One of the stated goals is to acquire as few homes as possible and displace as few residents as possible. In the sake and name of "concrete" savings and in deference to so-called non-economic remainders or remnants, are we willing to take an elderly family and hoist them off their property? Humble suggested that the relocation assistance costs for such a move would certainly far outweigh the costs incurred for a few additional cubic yards of concrete. Todd and Lisa own the property across the road. There are also numerous outbuildings that Todd uses to support farming over 500 acres in the immediate area.

In summary, Humble stated that the Hornungs favor the 1999 version – it is the advancement north on the existing map that has caused them problems.

5. Todd Hornung, 1010 West 11th in Wahoo, works in Wahoo but he also farms 500 acres in the South Beltway area. He testified that he utilizes the building site in question that is planned to be taken away from his parents. He stores his farm machinery, seed, supplies, and tools there. It is their headquarters unit. 460 acres of his operation is within one mile of this building site. By taking that building site it does dramatically impact how he will operate his business as a farmer. Hornung stated that he supports the South Beltway, but he would ask that it be considered to be realigned to go a little bit south so as to save his parents' home. His dad is 89 and his mother is 84. They have always been told that the first objective would be to stay away from

homes and avoid them at all costs. He encouraged the Planning Commission to recommend realignment to save the Hornung homestead and help maintain his farming operation.

Carlson confirmed that the Hornung property is R-12 in the DEIS. Henrichsen concurred.

6. Robert Retzlaff, RFD 1, Box 82, Walton, appeared on behalf of his mother, Theresa, and his sons, Matt and Jon, and testified in support of the staff recommendations, particularly in opposition to the East Far route. [\(Exhibit 10\)](#).

7. Terry Chambers, 14501 Rokeby Road (Highway 2), testified in opposition to the East Far route. The house he and his wife live in was built in 1887. His great grandfather settled the ground before that time. When Hwy 2 was widened in the 1950's, it took out the trees in front of home. In April of 1995, Chambers moved the house to the south side of the road 495' from the highway. At that time there was no Far East route. No one knew anything about it. Now they come and tell us that they want to put a ramp 150' away from our house. We could not register our house because we had moved it. This will affect his father and it will affect 80 acres of the homestead from which the house was moved. The off-ramps would cut the 80 right in half, and it catches the east/west 80 on the north, which were all part of the original homestead. It would take his father's house completely out. They remodeled the house last year. Chambers has been told that his house would not be affected by the noise, but he disagrees. He supports the East Middle route. He agreed to move his house previously to allow the widening of Highway 2, but at this point they are settled in and don't want to have to go through another move.

8. John Miller, Box 83A, R.R. 1, Walton (14101 Pioneers), testified on behalf of the Citizens for Accountable Route Selection (CARS) in opposition to the East Far route. CARS represents approximately 120 families that live and own property in or near the East Far route known as EF-1. [\(Exhibit 11\)](#).

9. Amy Cole of Denver, Colorado, testified on behalf of the **National Trust for Historic Preservation** in opposition to the East Far route. The National Trust regrets that the City and County are intent upon building a beltway. [\(Exhibit 12\)](#).

Carlson inquired whether the National Trust takes a specific position on the other amendments. Cole indicated that the National Trust is taking no position on the East Close or East Middle.

Schwinn asked if the National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private nonprofit organization. Cole concurred that it is.

10. Kathy Jisa, 6701 No. 148th Street, testified in opposition to the East Far route. [\(Exhibit 13\)](#).

11. Eleanor Francke, P.O. Box 266, Walton, testified in support of the staff recommendation that the East Far route is not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. [\(Exhibit 14\)](#).

12. Dean Petersen, 14400 Old Cheney Road, Walton, testified in opposition to the East Far route [\(Exhibit 15\)](#). Petersen is in the trucking business. The truckers now use 148th Street. Petersen believes that the East Middle is the best of the three options; however, he believes a fourth option of “no east beltway” is the appropriate solution, based upon the cost of land, disruption of the rural area, etc.

Steward inquired as to Petersen’s opinion of the South Beltway. Petersen suggested that the traffic problems are Hwy 2 from 84th to the west bypass. Petersen supports the South Beltway and believes it eliminates the need for an East Beltway. The Omaha traffic is coming in on I-80 to Hwy 77 going south; Kansas City traffic will drop off on the South Beltway. The truckers prefer to take Saltillo across to the West Bypass.

Newman assumes that truckers talk to each other and she inquired whether the motor carriers have endorsed any of the East Beltway routes. Petersen’s response was that the truckers do not like to go through the stop lights on Hwy 2. The traffic is there and the civilian population in the cars don’t like to have the truckers there either. He does not know whether the Motor Carriers Association has selected one route. Petersen believes that the East bypass should be eliminated and that putting in the South Beltway would solve all the problems. He suggested that widening existing streets such as 70th and 84th would eliminate the need for an east bypass. People are not going to drive four miles out in the country to get on a bypass.

13. Lynn Darling, 2601 S.W. 23rd, testified in opposition to all of the East routes. Choosing a beltway is not the issue—it’s about vision planning, a proven necessity or not. [\(Exhibit 16\)](#). Darling has learned and seen how other communities are succeeding in developing economical and sustainable communities because they have an all encompassing plan with citizenry consensus, with laws and regulations to implement the plan. Lincoln’s Comprehensive Plan is worthless because it is toothless. It is a waste of time, without proof of need nor alternatives. This report repeatedly uses the word “could” reduce—not “will”. Darling requested that the three East routes be vetoed until we have an

accurate, unbiased proof of need, along with alternative solutions that are economically and environmentally sensitive and down right pleasing. If you build it, sprawl will follow--guaranteed.

Darling stated that she is not opposed to the South Beltway.

14. Bruce Bohrer, 1943 Sewell Street, testified on behalf of the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, in support of the South Beltway and East Middle route ([Exhibits 4 and 5](#)).

15. Peter Bleed, 1315 No. 37th, testified on behalf of the Preservation Association of Lincoln (PAL). PAL has a history of somewhat more than 10 years of commitment to preserving the buildings and the places and landscapes that are important to the history of Lincoln. PAL strongly endorses and supports the joint recommendation of the staff. This is a major project and we've got to do it as well as we can. This is an opportunity to make some good decisions. PAL has been involved in this long process for almost 6 years. They have worked with other local advisory groups, the Historic Preservation Office and the National Trust. PAL is not convinced that the beltway is necessary. They specifically take issue with the point that roads don't cause sprawl--people cause sprawl. He agreed that roads do not cause sprawl, but roads will influence the location of specific kinds of institutions like stores, convenience stores, filling stations, etc., so that passing a road through a historic landscape will have a high detrimental effect. There are wonderful areas throughout Stevens Creeks and we should take care of it. We also have to acknowledge that in the southeast corner of the overall area there are numerous specific farm properties that are especially outstanding that preserve the kind of landscape that is reflective of our part of the world. Several of these properties have been evaluated in detail and found to be terrific, wonderful, great, nice and even significant. This area truly is one of our historic treasures and truly one of our signature landscapes. Building through this area would be very detrimental and PAL urges rejection of the East Far option. Six members of the PAL board stood in the audience.

Steward noted that in Bleed's own professional work, he is very concerned not just with historic sites but archeological sites and apparently the Stevens Creek area was one of the primary settlement areas for native Americans. Is there anything specific that you can say about the context of what we don't see in what we have transformed in some way? Bleed is satisfied that the archeological issue has been professionally carried out. It is an important area but not an intensively used area. It has been subject to lots of subsequent uses so that it is complex. We always have to be careful of those but he does not sense that there is a special need in that regard. He believes we can manage the problem.

16. John Ludden, 3727 Apple Street, suggested that if Lincoln expands to the east, it will most likely expand beyond the East Middle, and if this occurs, then we have a route that is going to divide part of our city. When you divide part of your city you are taking some of the heart out of it. It cuts down what is commonly called the social capital--the mixing of people together. Ludden believes that in the past 16 years, the automobiles have out-increased the growth of population. In 16 years, the automobiles have increased by 69% so you can see why we have traffic problems. There seems to be a monster out there that is consuming our cities--that is the automobile. Even though we all love them, he believes it is one difficult thing with which we are going to have to contend.

17. Earl Folliton, 4601 So. 43rd, testified in opposition to the East Middle route. He and his wife love to go to Walton and walk the MoPac trail. When you get to about 125th which would be in the East Middle route, there is no noise most of the time. You can't hear any traffic any place. The East Middle seems to be the most desirable, but personally, he doesn't like any of them. It is going to create urban sprawl. The money that is spent (tax money that we're going to have to pay some of) would be a lot better spent on restricting growth. We need to spend time and money restricting growth instead of expanding.

18. Ed Foy, 12501 Holdrege Street, testified in opposition to all of the East Beltway routes. He believes that development east of 84th Street is going to be rapid and expansive. Nobody remembers when we started development south of Hwy 2. We've got development down as far as Saltillo Road, and it is not going to stop. Once the decision was made to develop north of Cornhusker Hwy at 27th, we're now up to Interstate 80, about 4 miles in less than 10 years. When you cross 84th we will have a similar situation especially in the southeast part of the basin, and we are going to be out four miles in just a few years. When Lincoln starts developing east of 84th, we are going to be out to 148th inside of 10 years easy. This thing is going to take 20 years to develop. If you designate the pathway now, they are all going to be too close. You have to face the facts. The original EIS used a growth rate of 1.18%, yet Lincoln's growth rate in 1990 was 1.63%. We have already expanded to the south and north during the 90's. Now growth is going to push to the east. All of the East routes have fatal flaws. The East Close is too close and already impacts residences; the East Far, despite being too close, impacts a number of historic properties that we apparently didn't care about 10-15 years ago. The East Middle runs right down the middle of the Stevens Creek Watershed, more particularly the floodplain. It will affect tributaries and wetlands. There are serious questions as to whether the Federal Highway Administration would want to build a project down the middle of a floodplain. The fact is that this requires common sense. Nobody's land is more precious than anyone else's. Pitting neighbor against neighbor has been a very tragic consequence of this whole process. The EIS did not recommend any of the routes. The state is not taking a stand. We have also heard this evening that these routes will not have an impact

on the truck traffic.

The staff talks about multiple use corridors, yet the multiple use corridor is not defined, except that they line up with the LES power line. Foy pointed out that in the DEIS, LES states that they have no interest in sharing their easements with a highway. Foy does not believe that the power line is an eyesore. To use a power line as the reason for a beltway location because the power line has already destroyed the area is not true.

Foy also pointed out that somebody is going to have to pay for this. The lobbying has not been done because the choice hasn't been made. Some think it is going to be a federal project. How ridiculous is that? We don't know when the pools of money are going to be available. The city is going to pay dearly for a bad decision.

Steward commented that if the East Far is too close, should we put it in Cass County?

19. Paul Lemke, 13800 Pine Lake Road, testified in opposition to the East Beltway routes. It sounds like the people who live near the Stevens Creek area are going to lose more land. We have battled over NRD dams, the beltway, and other things. We are constantly fighting Lincoln to keep our way of life and to keep our area as it exists today. He agrees that no one's land is any more valuable to any one else than the other person's. Just because we do not have our homes on the registry does not mean there are no other properties out there. He wishes the City would not develop Stevens Creek and keep the plan of the dividing line of the drainage to be the east boundary of Lincoln. He supports the widening and upgrading of the existing road system.

Schwinn inquired whether Lemke's family is actively involved in agri-business. Lemke stated that his father and brother do farm. The East Middle will bisect an 80 of his brother's for one-half mile, and then it bisects the same amount of land of his father's. The East Far runs basically along the boundary line between his family and the neighbor's property.

20. John Beck, 10100 Holdrege, testified in opposition to all three East routes. It is no surprise that no one wants this built through their property. It is likewise no surprise that the consulting company, which is historically an engineering company, would support building a roadway on the route that has the greatest number of engineering obstacles. It is further no surprise that many politicians would support building a major roadway—it is more glamorous to build a large project than to improve something you already have or build nothing. Beck has been traveling through cities such as Dallas, Wichita, Kansas City, Omaha, Des Moines, Indianapolis, Davenport—the ones that seem to work the best are either those cities that have constructed some form of bypass or beltway well outside their

growth area, or the ones that have taken the route right down the middle and made a big giant path right through their downtown. Beck encouraged the Commission to reject all three of the East routes. He had no objection to the South route. He suggested we look at potentially improving what we already have. Yes, he would go into Cass County. If you go slightly to the east of the routes that have been discussed, the state already owns the right-of-way on Hwy 63 and 42. If you take the south end of Hwy 42 it runs awry at about A Street. The County or the people could do themselves a service by considering acquisition of right-of-way between that location and the beautiful overpass at 162nd & Hwy 2. If you do that you've got a beautiful path that is already on state-owned right-of-way leading you to the interstate from the congested areas of South Lincoln.

21. Joe Hampton, 1660 So. 70th Street, testified in support of the East Middle route. He stressed that everybody in this room will agree that all the people that live in the Stevens Creek Watershed deserve an answer. One of Lincoln's failings is that sometimes we plan and plan and plan, and then make piecemeal decisions. We are at a point in time when this community has a once-in-a-lifetime change to really do a first class job of planning a large growth area. It is projected that in the next 25-50 years Lincoln will double in its population. If it doesn't, then that means our young people are leaving the community and seeking jobs where there are opportunities. That is one of the problems that is very serious, not only in Lincoln but in the state. Let's not procrastinate much longer. This particular question has been studied and studied now for seven years. The concept of beltways has actually been discussed for well over 27 years. At one time, the state came forward with a recommendation that the south bypass would be on Yankee Hill and the east would be on 98th. And at that point in time, the impact on abutting properties was very insignificant. But we chose to do a piecemeal solution--ignore the problem; ignore good planning--and it is now too late. So we're proposing a south solution at Saltillo; we're proposing one of three to the east. "Folks, it is time to make a decision." The city deserves it. The people impacted and who live in the area deserve some sort of an answer--some predictability.

As far as where it should be located, Hampton suggests that to him it's a "no-brainer". Public Works, Planning and the administration have made a strong case that the East Middle should be an appropriate route. He says it's a "no-brainer" because we've already traded an impact there with the power line. We joined the power line with a major highway on Hwy 2 and it has not stopped the abutting properties from developing close to it. If you identify that route (and he believes that the East Middle is the one), then you can sit down and really go to work and do a very well thought-out land use plan--not just commercial or residential, but for all of the amenities that a community needs and deserves--and we're never going to find a better opportunity.

As far as the suggestion of “do nothing”, Hampton suggested that “do nothing” is no solution and it just says we abandon the concept of ordered planning. He learned a long time ago as a basic element of physics, every time there is an action there is a reaction. Any time you do anything it will have some sort of an impact on somebody. If we are going to have a growing and viable community, it is one of give and take and hopefully done with some foresight and some consideration of the people that are impacted.

Hampton urged that it's too late for the East Close, and the East Far will do little benefit in the lifetime of most people in this room, but the East Middle can be well planned and well thought-out and beneficial to everyone involved. “This is a tremendous opportunity—don't screw it up.”

This hearing will be continued on Wednesday, July 18, 2001, at 1:00 p.m. The Commission requested that anyone who has testified at this meeting not attempt to testify again. Further comments will be accepted in writing.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Walker
Administrative Officer, Planning Dept.